

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 6 of 12

### **REMARKS**

This paper includes a complete and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed February 9, 2005. Upon entry of the attached amendments, claims 1-18 remain pending. Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended. The subject matter of amended claims 1, 7 and 13 is illustrated in Figs. 2-5, 6A and 6B and described in the corresponding portions of the detailed description. Consequently, no new matter is added to the present application.

Each claim rejection presented in the non-final Office Action is discussed in the following remarks.

#### **I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are allowable.

#### **II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 – Claims 1, 7 and 13**

##### **A. Statement of the Objection**

Claims 1, 7 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention.

Specifically, the statement of the rejection alleges that the claims recite a “second control signal” but a “first control signal” is not found in claims 1, 7 and 13.

##### **B. Discussion of the Rejection – Claims 1, 7 and 13**

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 7 and 13, as originally filed, each comprise “a secondary control signal” not a “second control signal” as alleged in the statement of the rejection. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7 and 13 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 7 of 12

regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 1, as amended, comprises both "a control signal" and "a secondary control signal." Claims 7 and 13, as amended, each comprise both "generating a primary control signal" and "deriving a secondary control signal." Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been overcome and the rejection should be withdrawn.

### III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 – Claims 7–9 and 13–15

#### A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 7–9 and 13–15 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Jensen *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,003, hereafter "*Jensen*").

#### B. Discussion of the Rejection – Claims 7–9 and 13–15

Applicants' claims 7–9 and 13–15, as amended, are not anticipated for at least the reason that *Jensen* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each element or feature in the claims.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of *each element* of the claim under consideration." *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (*emphasis added*). Therefore, every claimed element or feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

#### 1. Claims 7–9

For convenience of analysis, independent claim 7, as amended, is repeated below in its entirety.

7. A method for operating a power control loop for a power amplifier, comprising:  
    measuring a power level of a signal output from the power amplifier;  
    generating an error signal by comparing the power level of the signal output from the power amplifier to a first reference signal;

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 8 of 12

generating a primary control signal responsive to the error signal in a primary control loop; and  
*deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal.*

(Applicants' independent claim 7 - *emphasis added.*)

The cited art of record fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the emphasized feature of pending claim 7 as shown above. Consequently, claim 7 is allowable.

Specifically, the methods and apparatus for signal amplitude control systems apparently disclosed in *Jensen* (see FIGs. 1-6 and the related detailed description) includes a power controller 401 inserted in a feedback loop between power sampler circuit 408 and RF power amp 402. *Jensen* is silent regarding a secondary control signal.

More specifically, Applicants' claimed limitation of "*deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal*" is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Jensen*. For at least the reason that *Jensen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal, *Jensen* does not anticipate Applicants' claimed method. Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable and the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 7 is allowable, dependent claims 8 and 9, which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 7, are also allowable, for at least the reason that these claims include all the elements and features of independent claim 7. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7-9 be withdrawn.

## 2. Claims 13-15

For convenience of analysis, independent claim 13, as amended, is repeated on the following page in its entirety.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 9 of 12

13. A system for operating a power control loop for a power amplifier, comprising:  
    means for measuring a power level of a signal output from the power amplifier;  
    means for generating an error signal by comparing the power level of the signal output from the power amplifier to a first reference signal;  
    means for generating a primary control signal responsive to the error signal in a primary control loop; and  
    *means for deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal.*

(Applicants' independent claim 13 - *emphasis added*.)

The cited art of record fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the emphasized features of pending claim 13 as shown above. Consequently, claim 13 is allowable.

Specifically, the methods and apparatus for signal amplitude control systems apparently disclosed in *Jensen* (see FIGs. 1-6 and the related detailed description) include a power controller 401 inserted in a feedback loop between power sampler circuit 408 and RF power amp 402. *Jensen* is silent regarding a secondary control signal.

More specifically, Applicants' claimed feature of "*means for deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal*" is not disclosed, taught or suggested in *Jensen*. For at least the reason that *Jensen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal, *Jensen* does not anticipate Applicants' claimed system for operating a power control loop for a power amplifier. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable and the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 13 is allowable, dependent claims 14 and 15, which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 13, are also allowable, for at least the reason that these claims include all the elements and features of independent claim 13. *See In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13-15 be withdrawn.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 10 of 12

#### IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 – Claims 7–18

##### A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 7–18 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Raynaud *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,410, hereafter “Raynaud”).

##### B. Discussion of the Rejection – Claims 7–18

Applicants’ claims 7–18, as amended, are not anticipated for at least the reason that the cited reference (*i.e.*, Raynaud) fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each element or feature in the claims.

Specifically, Raynaud fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the emphasized features of pending claim 7 as shown above. Consequently, claim 7 is allowable.

Specifically, the amplifier bias control system apparently disclosed in Raynaud (see FIGs. 1–5 and the related detailed description) includes an attenuator 12 inserted between a sampling means 11 and a comparator 16. The comparator 16 receives a controllably attenuated version of the sampled voltage ( $V_d$ ) and a reference voltage ( $V_{ref}$ ). No other reference signal is disclosed, taught, or suggested. Accordingly, Raynaud is silent regarding a second reference signal.

More specifically, Applicants’ claimed feature of “*deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal*” is not disclosed, taught or suggested in Raynaud. For at least the reason that Raynaud does not disclose, teach, or suggest deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal, Raynaud does not anticipate Applicants’ claimed method. Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable and the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 7 is allowable, dependent claims 8–12, which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 7, are also allowable, for at least the reason that these claims include all the elements of independent claim 7. *See In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7–12 be withdrawn.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 11 of 12

In addition, *Raynaud* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the emphasized features of pending claim 13 as shown above. Consequently, claim 13 is allowable.

Specifically, the amplifier bias control system apparently disclosed in *Raynaud* (see FIGs. 1–5 and the related detailed description) includes an attenuator 12 inserted between a sampling means 11 and a comparator 16. The comparator 16 receives a controllably attenuated version of the sampled voltage ( $V_d$ ) and a reference voltage ( $V_{ref}$ ). No other reference signal is disclosed, taught, or suggested. Accordingly, *Raynaud* is silent regarding a second reference signal.

More specifically, Applicants' claimed feature of "*means for deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal*" is not disclosed, taught or suggested in *Raynaud*. For at least the reason that *Raynaud* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a means for deriving a secondary control signal responsive to the error signal and a second reference signal, *Raynaud* does not anticipate Applicants' claimed system for operating a power control loop for a power amplifier. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable and the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 13 is allowable, dependent claims 14–18, which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 13, are also allowable, for at least the reason that these claims include all the elements and features of independent claim 13. *See In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13–18 be withdrawn.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 19308.0021U1  
APPLICATION NO. 10/712,136  
00CXT0262W  
Page 12 of 12

**CONCLUSION**

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-18 are allowable over the cited art of record and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any comments regarding the Applicants' response, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

**SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPEL GREENLEE BLAHA LLC**  
**CUSTOMER No. 35856**

By:



Robert A. Blaha  
Registration No. 43,502  
(770) 709-0069